

Julius Sanks feedback to the TCI

We do not need this initiative. It is based on the myth that carbon dioxide (not “carbon”), a naturally occurring trace gas, is creating some sort of climate crisis. It does not take much research into serious weather and climate science to understand it is an absurd claim. So to your goals:

1. Ensuring “carbon goals are met” will do nothing to improve communities. What goals? How does “reducing carbon” improve anything? South Australia and other places have already shown that replacing fossil fuel with other energy sources raises energy cost and lowers reliability. Learn from the mistakes of others; we do not need to re-learn them here.
2. Low-carbon technologies do not create jobs; they eliminate jobs. They seem to create jobs because they are so inefficient and expensive they require more employees per unit of energy delivered. But the result is fewer jobs in other sectors as energy cost goes up.
3. Your price & investment sharing goal sure looks like you expect taxpayers who are in areas that need no improvement to foot the bill for areas whose governments have done a poor job of designing infrastructure. I am not interested in helping northern New Jersey solve its traffic woes. New Jersey has never, to my knowledge, ever done anything for my state or county. New Jersey’s financial situation is not my problem. Besides, governments do not “price and invest.” They tax and spend.
4. Of course we want a resilient traffic system. Your initiative does not have a single word about how you will achieve this. It is nothing but an attempt to eliminate fossil fuel. That does not and will not make any system more resilient. It does not even make the power grid more resilient. Ditto for your goal of “health benefits.” Atmospheric carbon dioxide, even in transportation corridors, is not high enough to harm anyone, though plants love higher CO2 levels. Nor will it ever be; current CO2 levels are far below anything that can harm us.

I live in suburbia. Mass transit is not practical here. It is even less practical in rural areas. But mass transit is surely your actual goal, since electric cars, though silly, are already on the market. And not very popular; very few are sold. The public doesn’t want “green” transportation. If all this green technology is so great, why does it need massive subsidies, yet still cost more per unit of energy than fossil?

This is nothing but an attempt to use socialist redistribution to fund expensive, inefficient, and unreliable green technologies that cannot stand on their own in the marketplace. Why does your organization even exist if this is what it does?